

REVISED- MINUTES
BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY
Monday, May 17, 2010
City Hall
100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 604
Green Bay, WI 54301
3:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Darlene Hallet- Chair, Michael Welch-Vice Chair, Paul Kendle, Rich Aicher

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Tom Diedrick

MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

OTHERS PRESENT: Robert Strong (arrived 3:15 p.m.), Robyn Hallet, Noel Halvorsen (arrived at 3:20 p.m.), DonElla Payne, Matt Roberts, Chip Law

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of the minutes from the April 19, 2010, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority.

A motion was made by M. Welch and seconded by P. Kendle to approve the minutes from the April 19, 2010, meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority. Motion carried.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

R. Hallet stated that D. Hallet would be stepping out of the position of Chair and M. Welch would be stepping out of the position of Vice Chair. Based on the rotation that the Authority has followed in the past, M. Welch would now fill the role of Chair and P. Kendle would fill the role of Vice Chair.

R. Hallet called for nominations for Chair.

R. Aicher nominated M. Welch for Chair.

R. Hallet called two additional times for any other nominations for Chair. There were none.

A motion was made by P. Kendle and seconded by R. Aicher to close the nominations and accept M. Welch as BCHA Chair. **Motion carried by unanimous vote.**

Chair M. Welch called for nominations for Vice Chair.

D. Hallet nominated P. Kendle for Vice Chair.

M. Welch called two additional times for any other nominations for Vice Chair. There were none.

A motion was made by D. Hallet and seconded by R. Aicher to close the nominations for Vice Chair and accept P. Kendle as BCHA Vice Chair. **Motion carried by unanimous vote.**

COMMUNICATIONS:

2. Letter from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development dated April 29, 2010, notifying the BCHA that it's final SEMAP score is 100% for fiscal year ending 12/31/2009.

R. Hallet stated that several months ago the Authority was informed that the SEMAP was 100% and this letter is confirmation from HUD of that SEMAP score.

REPORTS:

3. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program
 - A. Preliminary Applications
D. Payne stated that there were 155 preliminary applications for the month of April.
 - B. Housing Assistance Payments
D. Payne stated that the HAP for the month of April was \$1,008,594.00
 - C. Housing Assistance Unit Count
D. Payne stated that the unit count for April was 2,732.
 - D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance
M. Roberts stated that the initial inspection pass was at 38.70%, the pass re-evaluation was at 31.36%, and the fail rate dropped to 29.94%.
 - E. Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Costs and HUD 52681B
C. Law stated that there is a significant shift because of the FSS funding that came through for the two positions, which shifted everything as far as administrative dollars being spent. We are \$42,692.00 under budget through April.
 - F. Portability Activity
D. Payne stated that there were 49 port-outs in April, in the amount of \$40,695.00, and 21 port-ins in the amount of \$7,687.00.
 - G. SEMAP Monitoring Report
D. Payne stated that the SEMAP is still high. It was at 99% for April.
 - H. Report of the Housing Choice Voucher Family Self-Sufficiency Program.
D. Payne stated that there were 104 clients in the month of April. There were 40 escrow accounts through April. There was 1 graduate in April. There were six new contracts established.
 - I. Report on the Housing Choice Voucher Home Ownership Option.

D. Payne stated that we have 97 homeownership clients in April. One graduated and two had payments abated for not getting back to us with their annuals.

J. VASH Reports

D. Payne stated that this is the report for the Veterans. We had 1 in April.

K. Report on Langan Investigations Criminal Background Screening and Fraud Investigations

D. Payne stated that there were 7 investigations that remain open for the month of April. There is still 1 investigation from February that remains open and is continuing to be worked on.

R. Hallet asked that item 4 be postponed until N. Halvorsen arrives and then take items 4, 7, and 8 together.

A motion was made by D. Hallet and seconded by R. Aicher to postpone those items until N. Halvorsen arrives and then take them together. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

5. Discussion and direction on use of data collected on new optional residency questionnaire for HCV applicants requesting how long they've lived in Brown County and why they've chosen to live in Brown County.

R. Hallet stated that for awhile there has been the perception that this program is drawing people from outside of the county and into this area. She has been considering if we should somehow obtain information regarding where applicants are moving from so we can gauge if that perception is accurate or not. She has put together a form to collect this data which is included in the agenda packet. She did contact HUD and some folks from Fair Housing at HUD to see if they had any concerns with us collecting this information. No one from HUD expressed any real concern but did give some suggestions for modifying the form. When we went to the Administrative Committee meeting last month we did explain that we would start using this form and afterwards, a county supervisor who was part of the audience, approached us and stated that it might not be wise to make policy based on information that is collected on an optional form. That is what prompted her to speak with HUD but HUD did not have any problem with this. Up until now we had thought of attaching this to the preliminary application so whether someone is denied or not, the form would be filled out. It was later suggested that perhaps we would only want people who are offered a voucher fill out the form.

D. Hallet suggested that this may make sense because if they are not eligible, we don't need the information.

R. Aicher stated that the primary reason that we look for this kind of information is so that we can understand who is applying for the program even if they are not approved. People have opinions about who is applying and where they come from so if we have actual data that shows this information, it gives us some anecdotal information we can share.

R. Hallet stated that what we have been doing, and what we think is the best way to do this, is to detach this form from the rest of the application so that we are not associating that information to whether or not they are being approved. We clearly state on the form that the information will not be used to determine eligibility. We can't base a person's residency on how long they have lived here and we don't want to give the perception that we are.

R. Aicher questioned if we have the choice to make this form optional or mandatory or is this the way it must be.

R. Hallet responded that because we can't base their residency on how long they've lived here, it was her conclusion that the form must be optional.

P. Kendle stated that requiring it would lose the anonymity component.

R. Aicher stated that it tells us a lot if we know who is applying for the program and how long they've been in the community, whether they are approved or not. If we see lots of applicants have been in the community a month or less it probably tells us that people are moving here and applying for assistance.

M. Welch stated that with the form being optional it would be good to track how many forms are given out compared to how many are received back. It would be interesting to know the completion percentage.

R. Aicher stated that it might make sense to do this for a trial period and then reevaluate to determine if this should be ongoing.

R. Strong stated that with the form being optional we do have to be careful what we use the information for and how it effects our policy decisions here. We will need to determine how we will use the data. He doesn't mind sharing what we learn with HUD and maybe even Washington to show them what is happening in Brown County.

R. Hallet shared some statistics based on responses that have been received since we started to use the form. From April 28, 2010, through May 5, 2010, we collected 15 surveys. Thirteen of the surveys indicated that the applicants are currently living in Brown County. The average length of time for those respondents was 12 years in Brown County. That is positive, showing that most are long term residents. Of those that responded that they did live in Brown County, the 3 shortest lengths of time reported were one month, half a year, and one and half years. The places that they have moved from include River Rouge, MI; Grand Rapids, MI; Chicago, IL; and Oconto County. One of those individuals previously lived in Brown County in 2008 and prior to that lived here for 8 years. The biggest reason that people moved here was family living in the area. Next was a tie between jobs and low crime rates. The other reasons were schools, availability of housing units, adult education opportunities, environment, friendliness of people living here, and community involvement opportunities.

R. Aicher questioned what percentage of applicants filled out the form.

R. Hallet estimated that there would have been 30 to 40 given out in a week's time and we received 15 back. However, there may have been applications that people picked up prior to the form being used and happened to turn their application in that week.

M. Welch asked how the data is being tracked.

R. Hallet stated that she has not decided yet but is open to suggestions.

M. Welch stated that the County might have Survey Monkey that could be used to enter online.

R. Hallet stated that she has heard of Survey Monkey and could look into it but doesn't know if that requires the survey to be completed on line or if we would have to enter each response ourselves on line, which could be time consuming.

R. Aicher suggested that we move forward with the form. He would want to limit the amount of time. He doesn't feel we can answer how we would use the data yet. It would depend on how many forms are given out and how many are returned.

A motion was made by R. Aicher and seconded by D. Hallet to approve using the new optional residency questionnaire for HCV applicants requesting how long they've lived in Brown County and why they've chosen to live in Brown County for a trial period of 90 days (May, June, July). Motion carried.

A motion was made by P. Kendle and seconded by D. Hallet to take item 4 at this time. Motion carried.

R. Hallet asked if instead, could we take item 6 next and then address items 4, 7, and 8 together. The ICS staff would like to leave after item 6.

The Authority agreed that would be fine.

6. Discussion and approval of Catholic Charities' proposed cost for Homeownership Counseling of Housing Choice Voucher Homebuyers.

R. Hallet stated that several months ago Catholic Charities requested to be an approved homebuyer counselor for the Housing Choice Voucher Homebuyers, which the Authority did approve. At that time the Authority asked them how much they would charge for that cost and today's discussion is to address that. Catholic Charities has indicated that they would charge \$500 per participant. On the back side of the letter from them, you will see justification for that. They have broken it down indicating specifically the services provided to the client ,how many hours and the cost. Catholic Charities believes that Homeownership Counseling often starts well before a participant is thinking about owning a home, when they are working with Catholic Charities on budget counseling. When their finances are in a state that they could conceivably obtain a mortgage, Catholic Charities would

formally start the homebuyer education. Post purchase counseling has also been rolled into this. Additionally, there is a cost for supplies and printing. The total for all of their costs per client is well above the \$500 that they are requesting reimbursement for. It was hard for Catholic Charities to estimate how many clients they would actually have in a year since they are just starting out. Right now they have estimated that it would be anywhere from one to five clients.

N. Halvorsen stated that they charge about \$500 per client also. They are funded about \$8,000 for this program and then they draw from those funds based on timesheets and direct costs.

R. Strong stated that he would like to see a cap on this so that it is not unlimited. If they use the funds that are approved they could come back and ask for more.

R. Hallet stated that Catholic Charities has clients that they are working with already for budget counseling and have built a rapport with them so this will make everything flow smoother for the transition into homeownership.

N. Halvorsen stated that he doesn't think they have ever had more than 14 clients in a year.

R. Strong stated that we should execute a contract with Catholic Charities saying that if they want to provide this service we would give them \$500 per family that they counsel and we would cap it at a certain amount of money. They are estimating a maximum of 5 clients so a \$2,500 cap would be reasonable.

A motion was made by D. Hallet and seconded by R. Aicher to approve the Catholic Charities' proposed cost for Homeownership Counseling of Housing Choice Voucher Homebuyers of \$500 per client subject to a maximum of 5 clients per year/\$2,500 total. Catholic Charities should request that this contract be renewed after 5 participants/\$2,500. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

4. Discussion and action regarding request of Mutual Housing Association of Brown County to retain the repaid HOME funds currently accumulated as well as anticipated collections through December 31, 2010.

N. Halvorsen explained the request. The attachment in the agenda packet was provided to show what the money would be used for over the next year. He stated that Mutual Housing Association (MHA) is in the process of working with NeighborWorks® Green Bay to have them take over ownership of its properties. The only other thing on the books for MHA is receivables for three loans from homebuyers. They would like to not have these assets on their books come the end of June. They looked at the expenditures of the MHA over the course of a year and based on some of those expenditures from 2009 and a bit of forecasting, he prepared a draft budget. MHA doesn't have any sort of staff or accountant so they hire someone to do their bookkeeping. Insurance was listed at \$3,000 and that is about \$1,000 higher than normal but he thought that there might be another year of coverage that would be necessary to extend beyond the last day of

business. Legal is a complete estimate. There could be 0 costs or there could be significantly more than \$5,000. He does not know what it would take to wrap up a corporation as he has not been part of that process before. Other/miscellaneous is listed as \$5,000 for surprises that might come up during this process. The \$37,600.00 is a not to exceed amount.

R. Aicher clarified that the 3 loans that were mentioned as assets are properties owned by individuals and that the MHA has taken mortgages on the properties so those homeowners are making a payment or have a future obligation for a payment back to the MHA.

N. Halvorsen stated that is correct.

R. Aicher asked if those 3 properties were listed in this consolidation.

N. Halvorsen stated no they are not. They are not part of the consolidation. MHA's Homebuyer Assistance Program made these GAP second loans. The outstanding balance between the three loans is \$130,000.00 and they have favorable rates.

R. Hallet confirmed that one of the loans is at a 3% rate and the other two are at 5.5%.

R. Aicher asked if these are monthly payment loans.

N. Halvorsen responded yes. Bank Mutual has two of the loans and Citizens Bank has the other loan.

R. Strong stated that is separate from what we are talking about here.

N. Halvorsen explained that the payments received on the loans is what we are talking about retaining. MHA is stating that these are repaid CHDO funds and are asking that BCHA let MHA keep them for our operating expenses for this year.

R. Strong stated that it is allowable to do this since it is for a project cost.

A motion was made by P. Kendle and seconded by R. Aicher to authorize Mutual Housing Association of Brown County to retain the repaid HOME funds not to exceed \$37,600.00 and utilize those funds to unwind the organization with the stipulation that an accounting record is kept against the budget proposal document so that the Authority can see how the funds were used.

N. Halvorsen stated that the logical termination date for all the business would be the end of 2010, and then a final 2010 audit could be done in the spring of 2011. The final resolution of everything would then be July of 2011.

M. Welch took a vote on the motion. Motion carried with all members voting in favor of the motion except D. Hallet who abstained.

NEW BUSINESS:

7. Discussion and possible action on the request by NeighborWorks® Green Bay and Mutual Housing Association of Brown County to approve a rental housing consolidation plan that includes the transfer of assets and liabilities (including loans from the BCHA) from MHA to NeighborWorks® Green Bay, the subordination of BCHA loans to new conventional financing, and the restructuring of BCHA hard and soft debt.

N. Halvorsen stated that some of these properties had a first mortgage loan from WHEDA and WHEDA had a 10% minimum prepayment penalty, so we were looking at a \$47,000.00 prepayment penalty. That has now been reduced to a 1% prepayment penalty and is \$4,700.00. He assured WHEDA that they would be able to afford that one. He explained that they would like the Authority to approve the consolidation assumption of the properties including their associated liabilities, specifically the loans from the BCHA and to agree to consolidate and subordinate those loans with the new financing not to exceed what the Authority is already sitting behind with their deferred loans. The properties with BCHA financing that would be affected are 145-151 N. Ashland (Green Bay), 747 Elm Street (De Pere), 1838 Oak Hill Drive (Pittsfield), 3066 Wedge Court (Green Bay), and 726 N. Broadway (De Pere).

R. Aicher asked if in the future, N. Halvorsen could provide the approximate value of the properties.

N. Halvorsen explained that at 145-151 N. Ashland the total of the BCHA loans are \$36,432.54 and they are proposing that this be put into a consolidated loan for that amount as a deferred payment, no interest loan due upon sale or transfer of property. There will be a new \$135,000 first mortgage loan at this property, consistent with the current first mortgage loan.

N. Halvorsen stated that 747 Elm Street is a rehab that didn't go forward. It was decided to raze the house and build a new one. The Authority has made a number of loans on this property. There is a loan of \$78,550 outstanding. There are four deferred payment, no interest loans in the amounts of \$100,000.00, \$12,500.00, \$37,500.00 and \$11,800.00. The total of the BCHA loans comes to \$240,350.00. The proposal is to refinance the \$78,550.00 with another party and take the BCHA off that loan. Then the balance of \$160,000.00 of soft debt on the property we would ask that the Authority consider taking \$80,900.00 as a deferred payment, no interest loan due upon sale or transfer of property and then take the additional \$80,900.00 as the same structure but it would be forgiven after 10 years. N. Halvorsen explained the reason they are asking for that loan to be forgiven is because there is more debt on this property than it will ever be worth. If they were ever in spot where they had to sell it they would have to ask the BCHA to take a loss on it. They are taking 1/3 of the debt owed to the BCHA and are going to finance it differently and in turn, agree to operate this for at least another decade and then after that the 2nd obligation would go away, there would be a chance that if it were sold, they would break even.

R. Aicher stated that if this were the only property in the portfolio this would make more sense. If you look at the entire schedule, the property on Ashland has more than \$80,000.00 of equity there so what happens to that equity when Ashland is sold someday. Why should the Authority eat \$80,000.00 now and then not have the advantage of taking the \$80,000.00 back on a property where there is equity. If there is going to be a restructure, why wouldn't the Authority want this restructured in a way so that the liens are more proportionately spread out among all the assets here.

N. Halvorsen stated that he hears what is being said but with a lot of these properties, the loans were structured with some soft debt in them, conventional financing, and a grant. There is a sink up at the front end of the projects where either this Authority or the Redevelopment Authority would put up dollars that actually got granted into the project and sunk. It never stayed on the property as debt afterwards. There are two exceptions to this in all the properties he has dealt with through MHA and NeighborWorks® Green Bay over the years. One is New Franken and the other 747 Elm Street. For these two projects, for some reason, all project costs that came in, in the form of subsidies from public authorities came in as debt. They shouldn't have been done that way. The \$80,000.00 should have been a grant. He understands R. Aicher's point but he is trying to put something in place now so this is something that has to be wrestled about later. A decade is a long time to commit to holding it and it is going to be over the company's head for that period of time.

P. Kendle stated that there is part of him that feels we created this mess so we should just eat the \$80,000.00. He understands what R. Aicher is saying about covering the \$80,000.00 with the overall portfolio but that gets a little tricky when you try to do that. Each property needs to stand on its own. We may take a loss on this money eventually so it might be best to take the loss now and clean this up.

N. Halvorsen stated that 1838 Oak Hill Drive (Pittsfield) has three deferred, no payment loans in the total of \$65,327.02. The proposed structure is a deferred payment, no interest loan of \$141,800 that would be due on sale or transfer. BCHA approved a new loan to take out the current first mortgage in 2008 and has recorded the lien, but the loan has not been made to date because it was part of the WHEDA financing. At closing that loan would finally be wrapped up into a single obligation.

N. Halvorsen stated that 3066 Wedge Court has a deferred payment, no interest loan of \$22,420.00. They are proposing that this would remain a deferred payment, no interest loan and would be due on sale or transfer. NeighborWorks® Green Bay would have a new \$79,000.00 first mortgage on this property, which is slightly less than the current balance of approximately \$83,000.00.

N. Halvorsen stated that 726 N. Broadway (De Pere) has five deferred loans in the total amount of \$112,589.86. The proposed structure is to have those all rolled up into one deferred payment, no interest loan of \$112,589.86, which would be due upon sale or transfer.

R. Strong questioned if there was anything in the programs involved with the loans that would prevent us from consolidating these into one deferred loan.

N. Halvorsen stated that he had asked M. Schampers about that and he didn't think that there was anything that would prevent them from being a single note/mortgage. There just has to be a tie to a separate schedule showing what portion of each loan belongs to which account.

N. Halvorsen stated that the anticipated closing date for the consolidations would be June 30, 2010.

A motion was made by P. Kendle and seconded by R. Aicher to approve the request by NeighborWorks® Green Bay and Mutual Housing Association of Brown County to approve the submitted rental housing consolidation plan that includes the transfer of assets and liabilities (including loans from the BCHA) from MHA to NeighborWorks® Green Bay, the subordination of BCHA loans to new conventional financing, and the restructuring of BCHA hard and soft debt. Motion carried. Motion carried with all members voting for the motion except D. Hallet who abstained.

8. Discussion and possible action regarding use of future receivables on HOME loans.

R. Hallet stated that she hadn't included the handout that N. Halvorsen had given her with the agenda because there was to be discussion on this between N. Halvorsen, R. Strong, and herself, which didn't take place until after the agenda was sent out. She provided copies at this time.

N. Halvorsen stated that there are three borrowers that currently have loans from the MHA, which total approximately \$130,000 in outstanding principal. The borrowers make payments to their first mortgage lender who in turn forwards the monies to MHA on a quarterly basis. The proposal is to assign the loans to NeighborWorks® Green Bay and then we would collect the quarterly payments. As these are repaid CHDO funds, they are proposing to retain 50% of the proceeds for operation as a CHDO and the balance of the receipts would be restricted for use in making new loans to homebuyers within Brown County, but outside the City of Green Bay. For convenience, these would be funds for the Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Option Program. In the event of a payoff of one of the notes, NeighborWorks® Green Bay would retain \$5,000 of the payoff amount for CHDO operations and restrict the balance for the loan program. There is an alternate proposal, which would be the same as above, but if the loan fund balance should exceed \$20,000 (i.e. a payoff has been received), NeighborWorks® Green Bay may elect to make loans to Brown County Homeowners outside of the City of Green Bay to effect energy, water, or sanitary home improvements either as deferred payment loans, no interest seconds, or as below-market rate, fully amortizing second mortgage loans subject to HOME eligibility guidelines. If there is just a little money that comes in, they would make them voucher dollars for homeownership. If we received \$30,000 they could, for example, use the funds to make loans to help someone with a failing septic system

or with home improvements, accessibility modifications, or whatever else that would be eligible.

N. Halvorsen stated he and R. Strong had a conversation about this request. R. Strong said that he knows the CHDO regulations allow retention of 50% and he asked for clarification that what is being proposed is that if \$10,000 is collected in a year, NeighborWorks® Green Bay would keep \$5,000 of it for unrestricted operations. N. Halvorsen stated that he replied that yes he is. This is something that is allowable and is something that MHA did not do and could have negotiated for with the Authority. It doesn't reflect the actual cost of delivering the service. The actual costs for processing the checks and do all this is hundreds of dollars per year.

R. Strong stated that he is not one to say that they get half the money just because they are a CHDO, but that is up to the Authority, and that is why he asked N. Halvorsen to bring in the estimated actual costs of what it is going to cost per year and that could be taken out of the proceeds and retained for those costs. This money is repaid HOME funds and the Authority has the right to decide how it wants to use it. He doesn't have a problem with rolling those funds into being used again to make new loans to homebuyers, which is a good program. As far as the sale of a property, his feeling is that money should come back to the Authority and the Authority can give it out to NeighborWorks® Green Bay or any other entity that it feels is appropriate. N. Halvorsen is requesting to take the money and put it back into a program and then the Authority won't have to go through the process of soliciting proposals. There are some benefits from not having to go through an RFP and letting the money go back to the agency and let them continue on with the program. These are two options the Authority could choose from.

R. Aicher stated that historically we put the money out, it comes back to us, and we take a look at the next deal and decide from there.

P. Kendle stated that there might be some administrative costs to collecting the money back and there needs to be compensation for those costs. No matter who takes the money, it needs to go back into helping homeowners. We need to decide if we want to take possession of the money and control it or do we want to monitor NeighborWorks® Green Bay and make sure that they control it and put it back out into the community.

A motion was made by R. Aicher and seconded by P. Kendle to have the three loans currently under Mutual Housing Association of Brown County, Inc. be assigned to the Brown County Housing Authority and we ask the servicing banks to submit their quarterly payments to the Housing Authority to be receipted into the proper accounts.

R. Hallet asked if the motion included the 50% proceeds that they retain.

N. Halvorsen stated that the Authority is telling MHA that we are willing to take ownership of those loans. They would be assigned directly to the Brown County Housing and then NeighborWorks® Green Bay would be out of the loop, but as the

Authority accumulates cash, through our working relationship, NeighborWorks® Green Bay could be informed that there are dollars available for programs and then we could come in and make a proposal.

M. Welch took a vote on the motion. Motion carried with all members voting in favor of the motion except for D. Hallet who abstained.

INFORMATIONAL:

9. Review of assisted housing in similar sized communities, as requested by Administration Committee of the Brown County Board of Supervisors.

R. Hallet stated that the intern, J. Lopez, worked very hard on this project and pulled together a lot of detailed information.

R. Hallet explained that she and R. Strong have attended two of the Administration Committee meetings. At the first meeting they asked for information regarding how many vouchers we have in Brown County compared to other similar sized communities. R. Hallet made the point that they have to consider not only vouchers but other types of assisted housing because we have intentionally made more assisted housing available through vouchers in Brown County rather than investing in public housing and other types of assisted housing. In this data that was compiled, we have included the number of vouchers as well as the number of other types of assisted housing in various communities. One of the charts includes communities throughout the nation that are of comparable size to Brown County. All communities were selected based on having a population of 235,000 to 255,000, which is 10,000 under and above the population of Brown County.

R. Strong stated that there is the belief that we are providing much more housing assistance, far beyond anyone else in the country and this data shows we are right in the middle of the mix.

R. Hallet stated that in addition, we also pulled together comparison of the largest counties in Wisconsin.

R. Hallet stated that when they returned to the Administration Committee to present this information to them, the Committee inquired what composed the other types of assisted housing. One of the charts in the agenda packet has a breakdown of those different types to include Section 236 Housing, new construction/rehabilitation, moderate rehabilitation, low income housing tax credit, etc. The end result is that we are right where we should be in Brown County. This should dispel a lot of myths that we have too many vouchers. We have the number of vouchers that we do intentionally because public housing tends to carry some problems with it.

R. Strong stated that he has asked the Administration Committee that all future information that they need from staff should be directed to the Brown County Housing Authority.

BILLS:

R. Hallet distributed the bills to the Authority.

A motion was made by R. Aicher and seconded by P. Kendle to approve the bills as presented. Motion carried.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

A motion was made by R. Aicher and seconded by P. Kendle to accept the financial report as submitted. Motion carried.

STAFF REPORT:

10. Update on creation of limited term fulltime position to assist Housing Administrator.

R. Hallet stated that the Council did approve the creation of this position. It was posted for a week and we have accepted applications and will begin the interview process.

Chairman Welch adjourned the meeting at 5:01 p.m. Motion carried.

:dr